

REMARKS - General

In a telephone discussion between Dr. Dryer and the examiner Dr. Dryer mistakenly understood that the previously rejected claims could be the subject of a continuation in part without being subject to double patenting. The elements which were objected to in the office action correctly objected to a confusion in the referenced items.

In the referenced office communication, Claims 1-11 of the application were initially rejected. Following is a quote of that office communication:

“Regarding Claim 1, it recites the limitation “the composite subdocuments”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since it is not clear whether “the composite subdocuments” are implying to “multiple subdocuments in a single cover document” as stated earlier, or any other unrelated group of subdocuments. Furthermore, claim 1, recites the limitation “access to the subdocument” whereas it is not clear whether applicant implying access to one of the previously mentioned subdocuments, or any particular subdocument.

“Regarding claim 2-11, they are rejected because of their dependency on claim 1.

The original Claim 1 read as follows:

Claim 1

“A method of controlling the digital signature process to allow controlled creation, modification, signature generation and signature verification of multiple subdocuments in a single cover document, comprising the steps of: creating a protected cover document for the creation, display, and editing of the composite subdocuments and for controlling through the cover document access to the subdocuments for creation, editing, signature generation or signature verification; creating through a menu associated the cover document an access to the subdocument for edit and display of the subdocument in the cover document; creating through a menu associated with the cover document the transmission of a subdocument object to a signature-generation program to allow creation of a digital signature for each subdocument

and for the verification of that digital signature; and providing in the cover document a display and/or storage of any digital signature created for a subdocument, together with the information required or useful to use the digital signature.

The term "composite subdocuments" is not in the terms defined in paragraph 0016. However, the term "subdocument" is included as a defined term in paragraph 0016 as follows:

"The term "subdocument" is applied to a collection within the cover document of text, video, audio, graphical or pictorial data, or a mixture of these data forms, that is to be given a digital signature.

The term "subdocument" must be given the restrictive definition provided per the comments to MPEP 2111.01 (Plain Meaning [R-5] - 2100 Patentability IV. < APPLICANT MAY BE OWN LEXICOGRAPHER). The term composite may be misleading and the amendments attempt to address this.



NOTE: This document was e-filed and this is being sent as a confirmation copy

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence, and attachments, if any, will be deposited with the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to "Box Non-Fee Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on the date below.

Date: August 22, 2007

Inventor's Signature:

Joseph E. Luyer